

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application:

Bowler, et al.

Serial No.:

09/768,407

Filed:

01/24/2001

Group Art Unit:

3629

Examiner:

Fisher, Michael J.

For:

SYSTEM FOR FACILITATING ELEVATOR DESIGN

## **RESPONSE**

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on March 31, 2005.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn. There is no requirement that a "system" claim recite physical structure. The claims are clear in scope and content. Additionally, the specification describes an example system that comprises primarily software.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 based upon the *Wakelam*, et al. reference should be withdrawn. The *Wakelam*, et al. reference does not qualify as prior art against Applicant's invention. Applicant is entitled to a date of invention prior to the March 3, 2000 filing date of the *Wakelam*, et al. reference. As attested to in the Declaration of Scott Gaskill enclosed with this response, Applicants conceived their invention prior to March 3, 2000. Applicants also reduced

60,469-030; OT-4798

their invention to practice at least as early as within several months of March 3, 2000.

Because Applicants' date of conception is prior to March 3, 2000 and they were

diligently working toward completing a reduction to practice since at least as early as

March 2, 2000 until a date of completion at least as early as within several months of that

date, the Wakelam, et al. reference does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The Declaration of Mr. Gaskill and the attached copy of an invention disclosure

form are sufficient to remove the Wakelam, et al. reference from consideration as prior

art because it is not prior to the invention of the subject matter of this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance. If the

Examiner believes that a telephone conference will facilitate moving this case forward to

being issued, Applicant's representative will be happy to discuss any issues regarding this

application and can be reached at the telephone number indicated below.

Applicant encloses a Change of Correspondence Address form and asks that the

Patent Office direct all further correspondence to the attention of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

David J. Gaskev

Registration No. 37,139

400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 988-8360

Dated: 6-29-05

2



## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the enclosed Response is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\Ip00030\patent\Response 6-05.doc